

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00332 01 OF 06 041109Z

21

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 EUR-12 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05

BIB-01 /089 W

----- 058548

P 040830Z JUL 75

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 1093

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 6 MBFR VIENNA 0332

FROM US REP MBFR

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: INFORMAL SISSION WITH EASTERN REPS
OF JULY 1, 1975

REF: MBFR VIENNA 0325

FOLLOWING IS CONTINUATION OF INFORMAL SESSION REPORT
WITH EASTERN REPS OF JULY 1. PARAGRAPHS 1 THROUGH 8
CONTAINING SUMMARY TRANSMITTED REFTEL.

9. UK REP AS HOST WELCOMED THE PARTICIPANTS, INCLUDING
THE MILITARY EXPERTS. DRAWING ON TALKING POINTS APPROVED
BY THE AD HOC GROUP, UK REP SAID THE PARTICIPANTS
HAD AGREED THAT, FOR THE PURPOSES OF THESE NEGOTIATIONS, THEY
WOULD DISCUSS DEFINITIONS IN THE SESSION TODAY. PARTICIPANTS

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00332 01 OF 06 041109Z

HAD AGREED THAT AN EXPERT FROM EACH DELEGATION REPRESENTED AT

THIS MEETING BE INVITED TO PARTICIPATE IN IT. PARTICIPANTS HAD AGREED THAT DISCUSSION OF THE DEFINITION TOPIC SHOULD PROCEED IN PARALLEL WITH THE DISCUSSION OF OTHER MAIN ISSUES. IN THIS SENSE, PARTICIPANTS COULD DECIDE AT THE END OF THIS SESSION WHETHER IT WAS DESIRABLE TO HAVE ONE MORE SESSION ON DEFINITIONS BEFORE RETURNING TO THE DISCUSSION OF GENERAL TOPICS. PARTICIPANTS HAD ALSO AGREED THAT THE GROUND RULES FOR THIS DISCUSSION OF DEFINITIONS WOULD BE THAT THIS DISCUSSION WOULD TAKE PLACE WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO THE OVERALL POSITION OF EITHER SIDE.

10. UK REP STATED THAT PARTICIPANTS HAD ALSO TAKEN NOTE THAT EACH SIDE MAINTAINED ITS POSITION ON DATA. WESTERN REPS HAD TOLD EASTERN REPS THAT, FOR THEIR PART, THE ALLIES CONSIDERED THAT IT WOULD BE MORE PRODUCTIVE TO DISCUSS DATA AND DEFINITIONS TOGETHER. EASTERN REPS HAD TOLD WESTERN THAT THE EAST MAINTAINED ITS NEGATIVE POSITION ON DISCUSSION OF DATA. THE ALLIES BELIEVED THAT THE COURSE OF DISCUSSION ON THIS SUBJECT WOULD IN FACT DEMONSTRATE THAT IT WAS MORE PRODUCTIVE TO DISCUSS DEFINITIONS TOGETHER WITH THE GROUND AND AIR FORCE TO

WHICH DEFINITIONS RELATED.

11. UK REP SAID THAT, IN THE LAST SESSION, WESTERN REPS HAD MADE SOME POINTS ABOUT THE ALLIED DEFINITION OF GROUND AND AIR FORCES IN THE AREA WHICH HE WOULD LIKE TO RESTATE BRIEFLY. LAST TIME, WESTERN REPS HAD TOLD THE EAST THAT THE ALLIES HAD EXCLUDED FROM THEIR MANPOWER TOTALS ALL NAVAL PERSONNEL ON EACH SIDE. ALL OTHER FORCES IN THE AREA THE WEST CATEGORIZED AS GROUND OR AIR FORCES. THE ALLIES DEFINED NATO GROUND FORCES AS ALL ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL IN THE NATO COUNTRIES' UNIFORMED ARMED SERVICES LOCATED IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS, WHATEVER FUNCTIONS THEY WERE PERFORMING, EXCEPT THOSE WEARING THE UNIFORM OF NATO AIR FORCES. THE WEST DEFINED WARSAW PACT GROUND FORCES AS ALL ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL IN THE WARSAW PACT COUNTRIES' UNIFORMED ARMED SERVICES LOCATED IN THE GDR, POLAND AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA, WHATEVER FUNCTIONS THEY WERE PERFORMING EXCEPT THOSE ASSIGNED TO: (A) AVIATION UNITS; (B) GDR AIR DEFENSE MISSILE UNITS; AND (C) HEADQUARTERS,

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00332 01 OF 06 041109Z

SCHOOLS. LOGISTICS, COMMUNICATIONS, AND OTHER ELEMENTS SUPPORTING AVIATION AND SUPPORTING GDR AIR DEFENSE MISSILE UNITS; AND ALSO EXCEPT AVIATION PERSONNEL ASSIGNED TO DEFENSE MINISTRIES.

12. UK REP SAID HE WANTED TO EMPHASIZE THAT THE WESTERN DEFINITION WAS COMPREHENSIVE. THE ALLIES HAD INCLUDED IN IT ALL ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL IN THE UNIFORMED ARMED

SERVICES IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS, WITHOUT EXCEPTION, APART FROM NAVAL PERSONNEL. THE WEST HAD, FOR EXAMPLE, GONE ALL THE WAY BACK THROUGH THE MILITARY STRUCTURE AND HAD COVERED IN THE ALLIED DEFINITION ALL SUCH PERSONNEL, WHATEVER FUNCTIONS THEY WERE PERFORMING. AS HAD BEEN MENTIONED LAST TIME, THE WEST CONSIDERED THIS WAY OF DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN AIR AND GROUND FORCES TO BE SIMPLE AND CLEAR. IT SHOWED THE BASIS ON WHICH THE GROUND FORCE TOTALS THE ALLIES HAD GIVEN THE EAST HAD BEEN CALCULATED. IT PROVIDED A WORKABLE SOLUTION TO THE QUESTION

OF HOW TO SEPARATE THE TWO TYPES OF FORCES. THIS WAS THE WESTERN PROPOSAL FOR AN AGREED DEFINITION WHICH ALLIED REPS BELIEVED SHOULD BE USED AS THE BASIS FOR AN EXCHANGE OF DATA. WESTERN REPS WOULD APPRECIATE THE EAST'S COMMENTS ON IT IN THE PRESENT SESSION.

13. KHLESTOV, ALSO USING PREPARED TEXT, STATED THAT, IN OPENING THE PRESENT INFORMAL SESSION, UK REP HAD DEALT WITH A NUMBER OF PROCEDURAL MATTERS WHICH PARTICIPANTS HAD DISCUSSED IN THE PREVIOUS INFORMAL SESSION. UK REP HAD SPOKEN OF THE SEQUENCE OF WORK, THE FACT THAT THE POSITIONS OF BOTH SIDES ON THE QUESTION OF DATA. AS A MATTER OF FACT UK REP HAD SAID HIS STATEMENT REFLECTED UNDERSTANDINGS REACHED AMONG PARTICIPANTS AND VIEWS EXPRESSED DURING PREVIOUS MEETINGS. HE HIMSELF SAW NO NEED TO REPEAT EASTERN VIEWS ON ALL OF THESE POINTS, NOTABLY THE EASTERN POSITION ON DATA, WHICH WAS VERY WELL KNOWN TO ALL PARTICIPANTS. HE WISHED TO FULLY ASSOCIATE HIMSELF WITH UK REP'S WELCOME TO MILITARY EXPERTS. HE WOULD NOW LIKE TO PASS TO THE QUESTION OF WHAT DEFINITIONS SHOULD BE USED FOR THESE NEGOTIATIONS,

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00332 01 OF 06 041109Z

THE DEFINITION OF WHAT FORCES SHOULD BELONG TO GROUND FORCES AND WHAT FORCES TO AIR FORCES.

14. KHLESTOV CONTINUED THAT, ON THE BASIS OF WHAT HAD BEEN SAID DURING THE PREVIOUS DISCUSSION, ONE COULD CONCLUDE THAT THERE WAS A COMMUNITY OF VIEWS THAT A DEFINITION SHOULD BE WORKED OUT WHICH SHOULD BE USED FOR THE PRACTICAL SOLUTION OF THE TASK OF NEGOTIATING THE MUTUAL REDUCTION OF ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS IN CENTRAL EUROPE. THE FACT THAT PARTICIPANTS WERE FOLLOWING THE SAME APPROACH IN THIS MATTER WAS A POSITIVE ONE. THE EASTERN REPS ALSO SHARED THIS PRACTICAL APPROACH BECAUSE IT WAS EVIDENT THAT PARTICIPANTS SHOULD HAVE A CLEAR IDEA OF WHAT FORCES ALL OF THEM WOULD CATEGORIZE AS GROUND FORCES AND WHAT AS AIR FORCES.

15. KHLESTOV SAID THIS QUESTION WAS PARTICULARLY IMPORTANT BECAUSE, IN ALMOST ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANT COUNTRIES, THE STRUCTURE OF THE ARMED FORCES WAS DIFFERENT. FROM WHAT HAD BEEN SAID BY THE UK REP, PARTICIPANTS COULD DRAW A SECOND CONCLUSION. THE WESTERN APPROACH CONSISTED OF TAKING ALL THE FORCES IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS, THAT IS TO SAY, ALL FORCES IN NATO AND THE WARSAW TREATY WHICH FORMED THE ARMED FORCES OF EACH COUNTRY, AND TRYING TO IDENTIFY WHICH FORCES BELONGED TO THE GROUND FORCES FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE NEGOTIATIONS AND WHICH FORCES BELONGED TO THE AIR FORCES ALSO FOR THE PURPOSES OF THESE NEGOTIATIONS. IN THE EASTERN VIEW, WORKING OUT AN AGREED DEFINITION ON THE BASIS OF WHICH ONE COULD DECIDE WHICH FORCES SHOULD BE CATEGORIZED AS GROUND FORCES AND WHICH AS AIR FORCES SHOULD THEREFORE NOT CAUSE ANY DIFFICULTIES. WESTERN REPRESENTATIVES DURING THE LAST INFORMAL SESSION HAD INDICATED THE WAY IN WHICH THEY HAD DIVIDED GROUND FORCES IN NATO AND THE WARSAW TREATY COUNTRIES. ON THE PRESENT OCCASION, UK REP HAD REPEATED THE DEFINITION GIVEN BY THE WESTERN SIDE AT THE LAST MEETING AND HAD CHARACTERIZED HIS DEFINITION AS ONE PROVIDING A MEANS OF DIVIDING OR DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN ALL THE FORCES OF THE TWO SIDES STATIONED IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS WITH

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00332 02 OF 06 041131Z

21

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 EUR-12 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05

BIB-01 /089 W

----- 058712

P 040830Z JUL 75

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 1094

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY
USCINCEUR PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 6 MBFR VIENNA 0332

FROM US REP MBFR

A VIEW TO DETERMINE WHICH OF THESE FORCES BELONGED TO GROUND AND WHICH TO AIR FORCES. HE HAD SAID THIS APPROACH WAS A SIMPLE AND PRACTICAL METHOD OF DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN THE TWO FORCES.

16. KHESTOV SAID THAT, SINCE THE UK REP HAD ASKED FOR THE EASTERN REACTION TO THIS WESTERN CONCEPT, HE WOULD LIKE TO POINT OUT THAT ONE COULD NOT FAIL TO SEE THAT TO DIFFERENTIATE CERTAIN FORCES AS BELONGING TO GROUND OR AIR FORCES ON THE BASIS OF A CRITERION OF UNIFORM WAS IMPOSSIBLE IN PRACTICE.

17. KHESTOV SAID THE UK REP HAD EMPHASIZED THAT THE WESTERN PARTICIPANTS HAD CAREFULLY GONE THROUGH THE WHOLE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE TWO MILITARY GROUPINGS. IF THIS WEEK THE CASE, THEN IT SHOULD BE VERY WELL KNOWN TO WESTERN REPS THAT, DUE TO DIFFERENCES IN THE STRUCTURE OF THE ARMED FORCES
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00332 02 OF 06 041131Z

OF THE VARIOUS COUNTRIES IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS, ARMED FORCES PERSONNEL PERFORMING SIMILAR FUNCTIONS IN VARIOUS COUNTRIES WORE DIFFERENT UNIFORMS.

18. KHESTOV SAID THAT DIFFERENCES OF THIS TYPE COULD BE OBSERVED IN THE ARMED FORCES OF STATES BOTH ON THE NATO AND ON THE WARSAW PACT SIDE. THEREFORE, EASTERN REPS WERE OF THE VIEW THAT IT WAS NECESSARY TO REACH AGREEMENT ON THE BASIS OF WHICH ALL PARTICIPANTS WOULD CATEGORIZE THE FORCES PERFORMING SIMILAR FUNCTIONS AS BELONGING TO THE SAME FORCES, EITHER TO GROUND FORCES OR, RESPECTIVELY, TO AIR FORCES.

19. KHESTOV CONTINUED THAT, THEREFORE, EASTERN REPS PROPOSED THE FOLLOWING DEFINITION FOR THE PURPOSES OF THESE NEGOTIATIONS OF FORCES WHICH SHOULD BELONG TO THE GROUND FORCES AND AIR FORCES IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS: IN THE OPINION OF THE EAST, THE FOLLOWING FORCES COULD BE CATEGORIZED AS GROUND FORCES: MOTORIZED RIFLE (MECHANIZED INFANTRY); TANK (ARMORED); AIRBORNE; MOUNTAIN INFANTRY; MISSILE; ARTILLERY; AIR DEFENSE MISSILE FORCES; ARMY AVIATION; AND THEIR COMBAT SUPPORT AND MAINTENANCE FORCES; AS WELL AS TERRITORIAL FORCES. THE EAST CONSIDERED THAT THE FOLLOWING FORCES SHOULD BE CATEGORIZED AS AIR FORCES: FIGHTER; FIGHTER BOMBER; BOMBER; RECONNAISSANCE; TRANSPORT AVIATION; AIR DEFENSE MISSILE FORCES; AS WELL AS COMBAT SUPPORT AND

MAINTENANCE FORCES OF AIR FORCES AND AIR DEFENSE FORCES.

20. KHESTOV SAID THAT THE GOAL OF THIS DEFINITION, AS OF THE WESTERN DEFINITION, WAS TO DISTINGUISH BETWEEN GROUND FORCES AND AIR FORCES FOR THE PURPOSES OF THESE NEGOTIATIONS AND TO CATEGORIZE IN THESE TWO CATEGORIES ALL FORCES IN THE AREA, THOSE FORCES WHICH IN EACH OF THE NATO OR WARSAW TREATY COUNTRIES CONSTITUTED THE ARMED FORCES OF THOSE DIRECT PARTICIPANT COUNTRIES.

21. KHESTOV SAID HE WOULD NOW LIKE TO DISTRIBUTE A RUSSIAN LANGUAGE TEXT OF WHAT EAST HAD JUST SAID TO WESTERN REPS. IN ENGLISH (COMMENT: TEXT CONTAINS MINOR VARIATIONS OF THE LANGUAGE USED BY KHESTOV'S INTERPRETER. END COMMENT).

INFORMAL TRANSLATION OF THIS TEXT IS AS FOLLOWS: BEGIN
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00332 02 OF 06 041131Z

TEXT: FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE PRESENT NEGOTIATIONS, THE FOLLOWING FORCES LOCATED IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS BELONG TO GROUND FORCES AND AIR FORCES:

GROUND FORCES: MOTORIZED RIFLE (MECHANIZED INFANTRY); TANK (ARMORED); AIRBORNE, MOUNTAIN-INFANTRY; MISSILE (COMMENT: SSM'S); ARTILLERY FORCES; AIR DEFENSE MISSILE FORCES; ARMY AVIATION; FORCES FOR COMBAT LOGISTICS AND SERVICES OF THE ABOVE; AND ALSO TERRITORIAL FORCES.

AIR FORCES: FIGHTER; FIGHT-BOMBER; BOMBER; RECONNAISSANCE; TRANSPORT AVIATION; AIR DEFENSE MISSILE FORCES OF THE PVO (COMMENT: AIR DEFENSE); AND ALSO FORCES OF COMBAT LOGISTICS AND SERVICES OF THE AIR FORCES AND PVO. END TEXT.

22. KHESTOV SAID THAT WHAT HE HAD JUST DISTRIBUTED WAS NOT AN OFFICIAL TEXT, A PROPOSAL, OR A DRAFT. HE HAD DISTRIBUTED IT MERELY BECAUSE EASTERN PARTICIPANTS COULD NOT BE SURE WHETHER THEIR EQUIVALENTS OF RUSSIAN EXPRESSION IN ENGLISH WERE CORRECT AND CORRESPONDED TO THE RUSSIAN TEXT. THEY EXPECTED WESTERN RUSSIAN LANGUAGE SPECIALISTS WOULD TRY AND SEE WHETHER THE TRANSLATION EASTERN REPS HAD JUST GIVEN CORRESPONDED FULLY TO THE ACTUAL RUSSIAN TEXT. THE STATUS OF THE PAPER THEREFORE WAS SIMILAR TO THAT OF ORAL STATEMENTS IN THESE SESSIONS AND IT HAD MERELY BEEN PROVIDED FOR CONVENIENCE TO MAKE SURE THERE WAS NO DISTORTION. EASTERN REPS THOUGHT THAT WESTERN EXPERTS WOULD SEE CLEARLY AND OBVIOUSLY WHAT WAS STATED IN THIS PAPER. THE PAPER CONTAINED A FEW DIFFERENT DESIGNATIONS IN BRACKETS. THIS WAS BECAUSE THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES USED THE TERM "MOTOR RIFLE" AND WESTERN COUNTRIES USED FOR THE SAME TYPE OF FORCES "MECHANIZED INFANTRY." NATURALLY, WHEN EASTERN REPS USED THE TERM

"MOTORIZED RIFLE," THEY MEANT ALL FORCES WHICH CAME UNDER THIS CATEGORY. THE SAME POINT APPLIED TO THE WORD "TANK" AND "ARMORED." IN THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES, THIS TYPE OF FORCES WERE CALLED "TANKS" AND IN THE WEST WERE CALLED "ARMORED."

23. KHLESTOV CONTINUED THAT, AS TO THE TERM "COMBAT SUPPORT AND MAINTENANCE," EASTERN REPS BELIEVED ALL MILITARY MEN WOULD KNOW VERY WELL WHAT FORCES CAME UNDER THIS
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00332 02 OF 06 041131Z

CATEGORY. EASTERN REPS UNDERSTOOD THE TERM TO REFER TO ALL FORCES UNDER THIS CATEGORY. EASTERN REPS WISHED TO EMPHASIZE THAT THIS DEFINITION WAS TO BE WORKED OUT FOR THE SPECIFIC PURPOSE OF THESE NEGOTIATIONS. THEREFORE, PARTICIPANTS WOULD HAVE TO REACH AGREEMENT ON A DEFINITION OF WHICH FORCES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AIR FORCES AND WHICH GROUND FORCES FOR THE PURPOSES OF THESE NEGOTIATIONS. IT SHOULD BE CLEAR THAT, IN MAKING THIS SUGGESTION, EASTERN REPS WERE NOT PROPOSING ANY CHANGE IN THE EXISTING STRUCTURE OF THE ARMED FORCES IN THE AREA OR ANY CHANGE AS TO UNIFORMS OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE NEGOTIATIONS. EASTERN REPS BELIEVED THAT THEIR PROPOSAL FOR AN AGREED DEFINITION WOULD PERMIT THE ACCOMPLISHMENT IN A MOST COMPREHENSIVE, ACCURATE AND AT THE SAME TIME SIMPLE WAY OF THE TASK THAT PARTICIPANTS WERE NOW CONFRONTED WITH. THEY BELIEVED THAT WESTERN REPRESENTATIVES WOULD AGREE WITH THESE CONSIDERATIONS AND THAT THEY WOULD ALSO AGREE THAT THE DEFINITION EASTERN REPS WERE SUGGESTING, WHICH THEY HAD DEVELOPED TO TAKE ACCOUNT OF THE REALITIES OF THE SITUATION EXISTING IN THE COUNTRIES IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS, PROVIDED AN EQUITABLE AND EFFECTIVE SOLUTION TO THE QUESTION UNDER DISCUSSION.

24. US REP SAID HE BELIEVED THAT PARTICIPANTS WERE IN AGREEMENT ON THE TWO GOALS THEY WERE SEEKING WITH REGARD TO A POSSIBLE DEFINITION. THE FIRST GOAL WAS A DEFINITION

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00332 03 OF 06 041139Z

44

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 EUR-12 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05

BIB-01 /089 W

----- 058766

P 040830Z JUL 75

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 1095

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 3 OF 6 MBFR VIENNA 0332

FROM US REP MBFR

WHICH WOULD INCLUDE ALL ACTIVE DUTY PERSONNEL IN THE UNIFORMED ARMED SERVICES IN THE AREA, APART FROM NAVAL PERSONNEL. THE SECOND GOAL WAS TO PLACE PARTICIPANTS IN A POSITION TO DISTINGUISH BETWEEN AIR FORCES AND GROUND FORCES.

25. US REP SAID THAT, FOR THE PURPOSE OF UNDERSTANDING SOVIET REP'S REMARKS, HE WISHED TO ASK WHETHER THE EASTERN DEFINITION WAS INTENDED TO INCLUDE ALL ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL IN THE UNIFORMED ARMED SERVICES IN THE AREA, APART FROM NAVAL PERSONNEL? SPECIFICALLY, DID IT INCLUDE, FOR EXAMPLE, ALL ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL, EXCEPT FOR NAVAL PERSONNEL, WHO WERE ASSIGNED TO DEFENSE MINISTRIES IN THE AREA?

26. KHESTOV SAID THAT THE GOAL WHICH PARTICIPANTS HAD SET FOR THEMSELVES IN WORKING OUT A DEFINITION WAS TO DECIDE WHICH
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00332 03 OF 06 041139Z

FORCES SHOULD BE CATEGORIZED AS GROUND FORCES OR AS AIR FORCES FOR THOSE FORCES STATIONED IN THE REDUCTION AREA AND WHICH WERE CHARACTERIZED AS THE ARMED FORCES OF A DIRECT PARTICIPANT COUNTRY. IT WAS NATURAL THAT THE FORCES WHICH PARTICIPANTS DEFINED AS NAVAL FORCES WERE NOT COVERED BY THIS DEFINITION. IT SHOULD BE CLEAR THAT THE NAVY WAS NOT INCLUDED. IF SO, IT SHOULD ALSO BE CLEAR IN WORKING OUT A DEFINITION

THAT ALL PARTICIPANTS SHOULD PROCEED FROM THE PREMISE THAT THIS DEFINITION SHOULD NOT COVER THE NAVY BECAUSE THE NAVY WAS NOT PART OF THE SUBJECT MATTER OF THESE NEGOTIATIONS. US REP SAID WESTERN REPS AGREED WITH THIS LAST STATEMENT, THAT THE NAVY WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE SUBJECT MATTER OF THE NEGOTIATIONS.

27. KHESTOV SAID THAT, AS TO US REP'S QUESTION CONCERNING THE USE OF THE UNIFORM AND SOME OTHER ASPECTS, EASTERN REPS WERE OF THE OPINION THAT PARTICIPANTS SHOULD USE THE CRITERION OF FORCES SINCE FORCES WERE STATIONED IN THE AREA AND THERE WAS A DEFINITE NOTION OF WHAT ARMED FORCES MEANT. FORCES MEANT ON THE ONE HAND, MANPOWER, AND ON THE OTHER HAND, ARMAMENTS. IT WAS NATURAL THAT THE FORCES IN THE AREA DIFFERED AS TO STRUCTURE. THERE WAS A STILL GREATER DIFFERENCE IN THE NAMES AND DESIGNATIONS USED FOR THESE FORCES. AT THE SAME TIME, HOWEVER, THERE WERE ESTABLISHED NOTIONS AS TO THE CHARACTER OF THE FUNCTIONS THESE FORCES PERFORMED AND AS TO THEIR MISSION. EASTERN REPS CONSIDERED THAT ALL FORCES OF THE TWO GROUPINGS WHICH PERFORMED FUNCTIONS OF SIMILAR NATURE AND WHICH HAD SIMILAR MISSIONS SHOULD BE CATEGORIZED EITHER AS GROUND FORCES AND OTHER FORCES WITH SIMILAR MISSIONS SHOULD BE CATEGORIZED AS AIR FORCES FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE NEGOTIATIONS, AND THAT PARTICIPANTS SHOULD REACH A CLEAR UNDERSTANDING AS TO WHAT FORCES BELONGED IN EACH GROUP, WITH THE OUTCOME THAT ALL THE ELEMENTS IN THE FORCES COULD BE CONSIDERED TO BELONG EITHER TO GROUND FORCES OR AIR FORCES.

28. KHESTOV SAID THIS EASTERN DEFINITION DID NOT PREJUDICE THE QUESTION OF STRUCTURES OR COMPOSITION OF THE FORCES. AS WESTERN REPS KNEW, THERE WERE, FOR EXAMPLE, DIFFERENCES IN THE STRUCTURES OF DIVISIONS. FOR EXAMPLE, US DIVISIONS HAD HAD 16,000 MEN AND SOVIET DIVISIONS, 10,000 MEN. THEREFORE, EASTERN REPS WERE NOT ATTEMPTING TO TOUCH ON DIFFERENCES AS REGARDS STRUCTURE OR OTHER ASPECTS. WHEN EASTERN REPS

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00332 03 OF 06 041139Z

DEFINED WHAT FORCES BELONGED TO THE GROUND FORCES AND WHAT FORCES TO THE AIR FORCES, THEY WERE COVERING ALL GROUND AND AIR FORCES OF EACH PARTICIPANT IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS. TO RETURN TO US REP'S QUESTION, IN VIEW OF THE FACT THAT, IN DEFENSE MINISTRIES, THERE WERE PERSONNEL BELONGING EITHER TO GROUND OR AIR FORCES, THE SUGGESTED DEFINITION WOULD COVER ALL SUCH PERSONNEL.

29. US REP NOTED THIS REPLY. HE SAID THAT, ON THE BASIS OF THIS RESPONSE, IT WOULD THEN BE CORRECT FOR WESTERN REPS TO UNDERSTAND THAT WHEN EASTERN REPS MENTIONED ALL FORCES IN THE AREA, THEY MEANT ALL ACTIVE DUTY PERSONNEL IN THE UNIFORMED ARMED SERVICES STATIONED IN THE AREA -- EITHER IN ARMY OR AIR FORCE UNIFORM. KHESTOV SAID US REP WAS USING THE TERMS "ARMED FORCES" AND

"ARMED SERVICES." DID THEY MEAN THE SAME THING? US REP SAID THAT, AS HE HAD JUST USED THESE TERMS, NO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THEM WAS INTENDED. KHLESTOV SAID THAT, BEFORE HE GAVE AN ANSWER, HE WANTED TO BE SURE OF THE PRECISE MEANING OF THE QUESTION. US REP SAID THAT WESTERN REPS WANTED TO BE SURE THAT THE EAST HAD NOT LEFT OUT ANY PERSONNEL FROM THEIR DEFINITION, SUCH AS TRAINEES IN MILITARY SCHOOLS OR INSTRUCTION PERSONNEL IN SCHOOLS, FOR EXAMPLE. ANOTHER EXAMPLE WAS THE REAR SERVICES MILITARY PERSONNEL. HAD BOTH THESE CATEGORIES BEEN INCLUDED IN THE EASTERN DEFINITION?

30. KHLESTOV ASKED WHETHER WHAT US REP HAD HAD IN MIND WAS WHETHER ALL THESE CATEGORIES BELONGED IN THE ORGANIZATIONAL OR LEGAL SENSE TO THE ARMED FORCES. US REP SAID THIS WAS WHAT HE HAD HAD IN MIND.

31. KHLESTOV SAID THAT EVERYTHING, ALL FORCES THAT BELONG TO THE ARMED FORCES OF EACH PARTICIPATING COUNTRY IN THE AREA, WOULD BE COVERED BY THE EASTERN DEFINITION. AS TO REAR SERVICES, THEY, TOO, WOULD BE COVERED BY THE TERMS OF THE EASTERN DEFINITION. US REP ASKED WHETHER THIS MEANT ALL LOGISTICS PERSONNEL WOULD BE COVERED. KHLESTOV SAID THIS WOULD BE THE CASE. US DEP REP ASKED KHLESTOV, WHAT ABOUT CASES OF EASTERN UNITS WHICH INCLUDE PERSONNEL FROM BOTH GROUND AND AIR SERVICES. KHLESTOV REPLIED THAT, AS HE UNDERSTOOD THE WESTERN APPROACH, WESTERN REPS HAD PROPOSED THAT ALL ARMED FORCES

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00332 03 OF 06 041139Z

IN THE AREA SHOULD BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT AND THEN DIVIDED AS TO WHETHER THEY BELONG TO AIR FORCES AND ARMED FORCES. DID THIS QUESTION MEAN WESTERN REPS WISHED TO GO BEYOND THAT APPROACH? US DEP REP SAID THAT THE QUESTION WAS ONLY INTENDED AS A FURTHER QUESTION TO ESTABLISH WHETHER THE EASTERN DEFINITION WAS COMPREHENSIVE.

32. KHLESTOV SAID IT WAS THE EAST'S INTENTION WITH THIS DEFINITION TO COVER ALL ARMED FORCES OF EACH PARTICIPANT IN THE NEGOTIATIONS. THIS WAS ALL FORCES IN THE AREA. AS HE UNDERSTOOD IT, THIS WAS ALSO THE WESTERN APPROACH. AS HE UNDERSTOOD IT, ALL PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES KNEW WHAT FORCES CONSTITUTED THEIR OWN ARMED FORCES AND WHAT THE ARMED FORCES OF THE OTHER COUNTRIES IN THE AREA WERE.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00332 04 OF 06 041157Z

44

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 EUR-12 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05

BIB-01 ACDE-00 /089 W

----- 058849

P 040830Z JUL 75

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 1096

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 4 OF 6 MBFR VIENNA 0332

FROM US REP MBFR

33. US REP ASKED WHAT DID EAST MEANT BY THE TERM "TERRITORIAL FORCES" IN ITS LIST? KHLESTOV SAID THIS POINT HAD BEEN INCLUDED BECAUSE EAST WAS ENUMERATING ALL FORCES IN THE AREA. IT WAS KNOWN TO WESTERN REPS THAT, IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS, THERE WAS ONE COUNTRY, THE FRG, WHICH HAD SPECIAL TERRITORIAL FORCES WHICH FORMED PART OF ITS GROUND FORCES. US REP SAID HE WANTED TO RETURN TO EASTERN USE OF THE TERM "ARMED FORCES." WESTERN REPS WERE STILL NOT CLEAR THAT THE EAST WAS COUNTING ALL ACTIVE DUTY PERSONNEL IN THE AREA. COULD EASTERN REPS TELL WESTERN REPS AGAIN WHETHER ALL ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL IN THE AREA WOULD BE INCLUDED UNDER THE EASTERN DEFINITION? UK REP SAID THIS NOT ONLY SHOULD BE ALL ACTIVE DUTY PERSONNEL, BUT ONLY ACTIVE DUTY PERSONNEL. US REP SAID HE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW THE ANSWER TO THIS QUESTION AS IT APPLIED TO THE WARSAW PACT FORCES IN THE
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00332 04 OF 06 041157Z

AREA. EASTERN REPS SAID THEY HAD INCLUDED ALL ELEMENTS OF THE ARMED FORCES. DID THAT MEAN THAT THEY INCLUDED ALL ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL? KHLESTOV SAID, WAS US REP ASKING ABOUT MILITARY PERSONNEL IN THE ARMED FORCES OR OTHERS? US REP SAID HE WAS ASKING ABOUT MILITARY PERSONNEL ON ACTIVE DUTY IN THE UNIFORMED ARMED SERVICES. KHLESTOV SAID WHEN EASTERN REPS SPOKE OF ARMED FORCES, THEIR DEFINITION DID INCLUDE ALL MILITARY PERSONNEL WHO FORMED PART OF THE ARMED FORCES OF EACH COUNTRY IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS. US REP SAID WESTERN REPS MIGHT SUBSEQUENTLY WANT TO ASK FURTHER QUESTIONS CONCERNING THIS THRESHOLD ISSUE OF WHETHER ALL PARTICIPANTS WOULD STOP AT THE SAME DIVIDING LINE BETWEEN MILITARY AND NON-MILITARY PERSONNEL IN THE AREA. HE HAD ANOTHER QUESTION, HOW DID EASTERN PARTICIPANTS DISTINGUISH AIR FORCE FROM GROUND FORCE MILITARY PERSONNEL IN THE AREA? KHLESTOV SAID THIS WAS THE VERY PURPOSE OF THE WORK EASTERN REPS CONSIDERED HAD TO BE DONE. OWING TO THE DIFFERENT STRUCTURE OF THE FORCES IN THE AREA, PARTICIPANTS WERE CONFRONTED WITH A DIFFERENT ORGANIZATIONAL PICTURE AS TO THE DIFFERENT FORCES IN THE AREA. THEREFORE, THEY SHOULD, AS WAS THE USUAL PROCEDURE IN NEGOTIATIONS, DEFINE FOR THE PURPOSE OF THE NEGOTIATIONS THEMSELVES WHAT FORCES SHOULD BELONG TO GROUND FORCES AND WHAT FORCES SHOULD BELONG TO AIR FORCES.

34. US REP, DRAWING ON TALKING POINTS APPROVED BY THE AD HOC GROUP, SAID THAT IT APPEARED TO WESTERN REPS THAT THE EASTERN EFFORT TO MAKE A FUNCTIONAL DEFINITION WOULD REQUIRE PARTICIPANTS TO MAKE A COMPLETE LISTING OF ALL OF THE DIFFERENT SPECIFIED TYPES OF FORCES WHICH COMPOSED THE GROUND AND AIR FORCES OF BOTH SIDES. THIS WOULD BE COMPLICATED AND TIME CONSUMING. MOREOVER, IT WAS NOT CLEAR THAT THIS EFFORT WOULD SERVE ANY USEFUL PURPOSE. WESTERN REPS THOUGHT THAT ALL HAD TO BE DONE FOR PRESENT PURPOSES WAS TO ENSURE THAT ANY DEFINITIONS WAS COMPREHENSIVE, THAT IS THAT IT COVERED ALL THE FORCES IN THE AREA, AND THAT IT ESTABLISHED A WAY FOR DIVIDING GROUND FROM AIR FORCES. THIS WAS EXACTLY WHAT WESTERN PARTICIPANTS HAD DONE IN THEIR DEFINITION. THEY CONSIDERED IT A FAR MORE PRACTICAL APPROACH

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00332 04 OF 06 041157Z

THAN THE EASTERN ONE. WOULD THE PRACTICAL EFFECTS OF THE MORE COMPLICATED EASTERN APPROACH BE ANY DIFFERENT THAN THOSE OF THE WESTERN ONE? IF NOT, THEN WHAT PROBLEMS OR DIFFICULTIES DID EASTERN REPS SEE IN THE WESTERN DEFINITION?

35. KHESTOV SAID THAT THE PROPOSED EASTERN DEFINITION FULLY ENCOMPASSED THE TWO GOALS WHICH US REP HAD JUST DESCRIBED. THE FIRST GOAL WAS TO HAVE A COMPREHENSIVE DEFINITION COVERING ALL FORCES. THE EASTERN DEFINITION MEANT JUST THIS. SECOND, THE EASTERN DEFINITION PROVIDED THE POSSIBILITY OF DEFINING IN A CLEAR AND EQUITABLE WAY WHAT SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE GROUND FORCES AND IN THE AIR FORCES OF ALL FORCES IN THE AREA.

36. KHESTOV SAID THAT IT WAS ABSOLUTELY CLEAR THAT THE PROCESS OF REDUCTION OR OF FREEZING AS WAS ENVISAGED IN THE WESTERN OUTLINE OF PROPOSALS SHOULD HAVE AN ABSOLUTELY EQUAL OUTCOME FOR THOSE FORCES PERFORMING SIMILAR FUNCTIONS IN THE AREA WHETHER ON THE EASTERN SIDE OR ON THE WESTERN SIDE. THE WESTERN METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH TO DEFINITIONS, A METHOD BASED ON THE CRITERION OF UNIFORM, DID NOT PROVIDE AN OPPORTUNITY TO RESOLVE THIS QUESTION IN A FAIR WAY AND TO ESTABLISH WHICH FORCES SHOULD BELONG TO GROUND OR TO AIR FORCES. HE WOULD CITE ONE EXAMPLE IN THIS CONNECTION, ALTHOUGH HE COULD CITE MANY: THE MILITARY PERSONNEL OF THE AIR DEFENSE MISSILE FORCES OF THE NETHERLANDS, BELGIUM, THE FRG AND UK WORE AIR FORCE UNIFORMS. BUT THE PERSONNEL OF AMERICAN FORCES OF A SIMILAR TYPE WORE GROUND FORCE UNIFORMS. 5#343*943, IF THE UNIFORM CRITERION WERE ADOPTED, THEN, ACCORDING TO THE WESTERN OUTLINE OF PROPOSALS, THE AMERICAN PERSONNEL PERFORMING THESE FUNCTIONS COULD BE SUBJECT TO REDUCTIONS, BUT THE PERSONNEL OF THE FORCES OF BELGIUM, THE FRG, NETHERLANDS AND UK PERFORMING THIS SOME FUNCTION WOULD BE SUBJECT TO A FREEZE INSTEAD.

37. KHESTOV SAID THAT, FOR THIS REASON, EASTERN REPS THOUGHT IT NECESSARY TO DEFINE ALL TYPES OF ARMED FORCES IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FUNCTIONAL CRITERION OF THE MISSION THEY PERFORMED AND TO CATEGORIZE THEM AS GROUND OR
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00332 04 OF 06 041157Z

AIR FORCES ACCORDINGLY. THE CONSEQUENCES OF SUCH A DEFINITION FOR THOSE FORCES IN THE AREA, WHETHER NATO OR

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00332 05 OF 06 041208Z

44

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 EUR-12 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05

BIB-01 ACDE-00 /089 W

----- 058931

P 040830Z JUL 75

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 1097

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 5 OF 6 MBFR VIENNA 0332

FROM US REP MBFR

WARSAW PACT, WOULD BE IDENTICAL. FOR THESE REASONS, THE WESTERN METHO OFDEFINING WHAT BELONGS TO AIR FORCES AND WHAT TO GROUND FORCES ON THE BASIS OF UNIFORM WAS UNJUSTIFIED, WRONG AND UNSCIENTIFIC. THEREFORE, IT COULD NOT BE USED FOR THE PURPOSES OF THESE NEGOTIATIONS.

38. US REP SAID THAT, IN THE LIST KHLESTOV HAD READ OFF, HE HAD LISTED AIR DEFENSE MISSILE FORCES BOTH UNDER AIR FORCES AND UNDER GROUND FORCES. WOULD KHLESTOV EXPLAIN THE REASON FOR THIS?

39. KHLESTOV SAID THAT THIS WAS BECAUSE, AS FAR AS EASTERN REPS KNEW, TAKING THOSE ARMED FORCES WHICH WERE IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS, THE GROUND FORCES OF BOTH NATO AND THE WARSAW PACT COUNTRIES HAD THEIR OWN SEPARATE AIR DEFENSE MISSILE FORCES. THERE WERE ALSO
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00332 05 OF 06 041208Z

AIR DEFENSE MISSILE FORCES IN THE AIR DEFENSE FORCES, AND IN THE AIR FORCES OF NATO AND THE WARSAW PACT. SINCE SUCH FORCES WERE AT PRESENT IN BOTH CATEGORIES, GROUND AND AIR, EASTERN REPS HAD CATEGORIZED THEM IN

THE ONE CASE UNDER GROUND FORCES AND IN THE SECOND CASE UNDER AIR FORCES. UK REP ASKED WHETHER THIS DISTINCTION HAD BEEN MADE ON THE BASIS OF UNIFORM.

40. KHLESTOV SAID THE EASTERN CRITERION WAS "ARMED FORCES", WHICH INCLUDED ALL MILITARY PERSONNEL. UK REP ASKED BY SOME AIR DEFENSE PERSONNEL WERE IN GROUND FORCES AND SOME IN AIR MISSILE FORCES. US REP ASKED WHETHER IT WAS CORRECT TO ASSUME THAT THESE FORCES WERE DIVIDED BETWEEN THOSE DIRECTLY ATTACHED TO GROUND UNITS AND ALL THE REMAINDER, WHICH EAST HAD NOW PUT IN THE AIR FORCE. IS THAT WHAT THE EAST HAD DONE?

41. KHLESTOV SAID MOTORIZED RIFLE OR MECHANIZED INFANTRY UNITS HAD THEIR OWN AIR DEFENSE FORCES. IN ADDITION TO THIS, THERE WERE INDEPENDENT AIR DEFENSE MISSILE FORCES ON BOTH SIDES AND AIR DEFENSE MISSILE FORCES IN THE AIR FORCES. THESE WERE NOT CONNECTED WITH THE GROUND FORCES. THE EAST, THEREFORE, HAD LISTED THEM UNDER AIR FORCES. THE SITUATION WAS THE SAME WITH REGARD TO THE WESTERN FORCES. THEY, TOO, HAD AIR DEFENSE MISSILE FORCES WHICH WERE PART OF THEIR GROUND FORCES. BUT BELGIUM, THE NETHERLANDS AND SOME SOCIALIST COUNTRIES ALSO HAD AIR DEFENSE FORCES FORMING PART OF THEIR AIR FORCES. THEREFORE, THESE AIR DEFENSE MISSILE FORCES HAD BEEN LISTED TWICE, UNDER BOTH CATEGORIES. THE FIRST GROUP WAS AIR DEFENSE MISSILE FORCES IN THE GROUND FORCES. THE SECOND CATEGORY WAS AIR DEFENSE MISSILE FORCES OF THE AIR FORCES. US REP SAID SOVIET REP HAD REFERRED TO ONE PROBLEM, THE CATEGORY OF AIR DEFENSE, WHICH, OR SO HE HAD SAID, AROSE BECAUSE THE WEST HAD USED THE UNIFORM CRITERION. KHLESTOV HAD POINTED OUT THIS ONE PROBLEM WHICH HE BELIEVED AROSE FROM THE UNIFORM CRITERION. DID EASTERN REPS SEE ANY OTHER PROBLEMS WITH THIS NATO DEFINITION?

42. KHLESTOV SAID HE THOUGHT WESTERN PARTICIPANTS KNEW AS WELL AS EASTERN PARTICIPANTS THAT, IN A NUMBER
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00332 05 OF 06 041208Z

OF INSTANCES, FORCES PERFORMING SIMILAR FUNCTIONS WORE DIFFERENT UNIFORMS. THEREFORE, THE CRITERION OF UNIFORM COULD NOT HELP PARTICIPANTS TO CORRECTLY DEFINE WHAT FORCES BELONG TO GROUND FORCES AND WHAT FORCES BELONG TO AIR FORCES. HE WOULD GIVE ANOTHER EXAMPLE ALREADY KNOWN TO WESTERN REPS: THE MILITARY PERSONNEL OF THE TACTICAL MISSILES IN THE FRG WERE IN AIR FORCE UNIFORM. AT THE SAME TIME, ANALOGOUS MILITARY PERSONNEL OF THE US FORCES WORE GROUND FORCE UNIFORMS. IF PARTICIPANTS ACCEPTED THE CRITERION OF UNIFORM FOR DEFINING WHAT FORCES SHOULD BELONG TO GROUND AND AIR FORCES, THE FRG

MILITARY PERSONNEL OF THIS KIND WOULD BE SUBJECT TO FREEZING, WHILE THE US PERSONNEL OF THIS TYPE WOULD BE SUBJECT TO REDUCTION. BUT THE FUNCTIONS PERFORMED BY BOTH GROUPS OF PERSONNEL WERE SIMILAR. EASTERN REPS DOUBTED THAT THIS WOULD BE AN EQUITABLE APPROACH.

43. US REP ASKED WHETHER EASTERN REPS SAW ANY OTHER CATEGORIES WHICH PRESENTED THE SAME PROBLEM? KHLESTOV SAID EASTERN REPS COULD ENUMERATE SOME OTHER CATEGORIES, BUT WESTERN REPS ALREADY KNEW THEM. US REP ASKED WHETHER KHLESTOV WAS REFERRING TO WARSAW PACT HELICOPTER PERSONEL IN UNITS ASSIGNED TO GROUND SUPPORT AS ANOTHER SUCH CATEGORY?

44. KHLESTOV SAID EASTERN REPS HAD GIVEN WEST A NUMBER OF EXAMPLES, WHICH WESTERN REPS COULD MULTIPLY, WHICH SHOWED THAT THE CRITERION OF UNIFORM WOULD PRODUCE AN INCORRECT OUTCOME WHEN USED TO SHOW WHICH FORCES BELONG TO GROUND FORCES AND WHICH TO AIR FORCES. HE HAD JUST CITED AN EXAMPLE WHERE THE MILITARY PERSONNEL OF THE TACTICAL NUCLEAR FORCES IN THE FRG WOULD COME UNDER THE AIR FORCE AND THE SAME PERSONNEL WOULD COME UNDER THE GROUND FORCES IN THE US FORCES. THE SAME HELD TRUE FOR AIR DEFENSE FORCES. THE MILITARY PERSONNEL OF THE NETHERLANDS, BELGIUM, FRG AND UK AIR DEFENSE FORCES WOULD BE UNDER AIR FORCES. THE REST WOULD BE UNDER GROUND FORCES. THIS WAS THE WRONG WAY TO GO ABOUT THINGS FOR THE PURPOSES OF THESE NEGOTIATIONS. EASTERN REPS OBJECTED TO THIS METHOD, NOT MERELY BECAUSE IT HAD BEEN PROPOSED BY THE WEST, BUT BECAUSE IT WOULD HAVE CERTAIN SPECIFIC

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00332 05 OF 06 041208Z

CONSEQUENCES. EASTERN REPS BELIEVED THAT ALL FORCES OF SIMILAR TYPE, FOR EXAMPLE, TACTICAL MISSILES OF THE FRG OR US, SHOULD EITHER BE IN AIR OR GROUND FORCES FOR THE PURPOSES OF THESE NEGOTIATIONS. IT WAS IMPORTANT TO HAVE THE SAME PLACE FOR THE SAME TYPE OF FORCES ON BOTH SIDES. THIS WAS A FAIR AND UNCOMPLICATED METHOD.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00332 06 OF 06 041220Z

44

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 EUR-12 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05

BIB-01 ACDE-00 /089 W

----- 059002

P 040830Z JUL 75

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 1098

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 6 OF 6 MBFR VIENNA 0332

FROM US REP MBFR

45. US REP SAID WESTERN REPS UNDERSTOOD THE POINT KHLESTOV WAS MAKING. THE TWO CATEGORIES HE HAD MENTIONED, GROUND BASED AIR DEFENSE AND FRG TACTICAL MISSILE FORCES WERE THE ONLY TWO CASES IN WHICH KHLESTOV HAD DOCUMENTED HIS ASSERTION THAT THERE WAS A PROBLEM WITH THE PROPOSED WESTERN DEFINITION. WESTERN REPS TOOK NOTE OF THESE TWO POINTS WHERE EAST ASSERTED THERE WAS AN INCONSISTENCY IN THE WESTERN DEFINITION. HE WOULD JUDGE FROM THE LISTING READ BY KHLESTOV THAT EASTERN REPS PROPOSED TO DEAL ON AN AD HOC OR A SPECIFIC BASIS WITH THESE PARTICULAR TYPES OF FORCES IN ORDER TO ACHIEVE WHAT EASTERN REPS FELT WAS A PROPER FUNCTIONAL GROUPING. THIS WAS AN INTERESTING SUGGESTION BUT WESTERN REPS COULD NOT FULLY EVALUATE ITS CONSEQUENCES WITHOUT HAVING THE RELATED DATA. TO ANSWER EASTERN QUESTIONS WHY WESTERN REPS THOUGHT THE EASTERN PROPOSAL WOULD BE COMPLICATED AND TIME CONSUMING, HE WISHED TO MAKE CLEAR THAT THE
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00332 06 OF 06 041220Z

WESTERN REPS TOO WERE NOT AGAINST THIS PROPOSAL MERELY BECAUSE THE EAST HAD SUGGESTED IT. WESTERN REPS WISHED TO JOIN THE EAST IN FINDING THE MOST EFFECTIVE AND SIMPLE WAY IN DEALING WITH THIS MUTUAL PROBLEM. BUT THE REASON WESTERN REPS CONSIDERED THE EASTERN APPROACH COMPLICATED WAS THAT IT WOULD REQUIRE LISTING AND CATEGORIZING MANY

SEPARATE TYPES OF UNITS ALTHOUGH THERE WAS NO DISPUTE AS TO THE BULK OF GROUND AND AIR FORCES IN THE AREA. HENCE, THIS WAS NOT A USEFUL WAY FOR PARTICIPANTS TO SPEND THEIR TIME. IF THE EAST COULD ACCEPT THE PROPOSED DEFINITION THE WEST HAD SUGGESTED, PARTICIPANTS COULD GO ON TO THE AREA WHERE THERE WERE A FEW PROBLEMS OF CATEGORIES WHICH PARTICIPANTS IN DUE COURSE COULD JOINTLY SOLVE AND THUS PERFORM THE TASK MORE QUICKLY.

46. KHESTOV SAID THAT, AS TO THE POINT MADE BY THE US REP AT THE OUTSET, THAT THE WEST COULD NOT EVALUATE THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE EASTERN PROPOSAL WITHOUT RESOLVING THE QUESTION OF DATA, HE, DID NOT UNDERSTAND WHY US REP HAD ONCE AGAIN RAISED THIS QUESTION. THE POSITIONS OF BOTH SIDES ON THIS ISSUE WERE KNOWN. THERE WAS NO NEED TO REPEAT THESE POSITIONS OR TO DISCUSS THIS ISSUE AT THIS TIME. SECOND, THE US REP HAD REFERRED TO THE FACT THAT EASTERN REPS HAD CITED TWO AREAS WHICH, AS US REP HAD SAID, CAUSED THE EASTERN CONCERN IN CONNECTION WITH THE WEST'S PROPOSED METHOD OF DEFINING FORCES ON THE BASIS OF THE CRITERION OF UNIFORM. THIS WAS AN INCORRECT ASSESSMENT, AND HE WANTED TO BE SURE THAT WESTERN REPS UNDERSTOOD THE EASTERN VIEW CORRECTLY. EASTERN REPS HAD WANTED TO SHOW THROUGH THESE EXAMPLES THAT THE UNIFORM METHOD OF DEFINING FORCES WAS WRONG AND COULD NOT BE USED IF PARTICIPANTS WERE TO FIND AN OBJECTIVE AND JUST DEFINITION OF DIVIDING THE FORCES IN THE AREA INTO THE TWO CATEGORIES FOR THE PURPOSE OF THESE NEGOTIATIONS. TO CARRY OUT EQUITABLE REDUCTIONS OF NATO AND WARSAW TREATY FORCES, IT WAS NECESSARY THAT FORCES WHICH WERE SIMILAR IN THEIR FUNCTIONS SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE SAME FORCE CATEGORIES OF THE NATO AND WARSAW PACT, WHETHER GROUND OR AIR. EASTERN REPS HAD CITED AS AN EXAMPLE THE FRG MILITARY PERSONNEL WHO UNDER THE WESTERN SCHEME WOULD NOT BE SUBJECT TO REDUCTIONS WHILE US PERSONNEL PERFORMING THE SAME FUNCTION WOULD BE SUBJECT TO REDUCTIONS IF THE CRITERION

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00332 06 OF 06 041220Z

OF UNIFORM WERE TO BE ADOPTED. THE EASTERN REPS CONSIDERED THAT FORCES OF THE SAME TYPE SHOULD BE LISTED UNDER THE SAME ARMED SERVICES, GROUND OR AIR, IN ALL CASES. THAT IS, ALL TACTICAL MISSILE PERSONNEL SHOULD COME UNDER ONE ARMED SERVICE. THE EASTERN REPS WERE NOW PROPOSING THAT THESE FORCES SHOULD COME UNDER GROUND FORCES BOTH AS FAR AS NATO AND WARSAW PACT FORCES WERE CONCERNED. IT WAS NECESSARY THAT REDUCTIONS SHOULD COVER SIMILAR FORCES ON BOTH SIDES.

47. UK REP SAID THAT THERE HAD BEEN A USEFUL EXCHANGE OF VIEWS ON THE PRESENT OCCASION. HE HAD SAID AT THE OUTSET THAT PARTICIPANTS SHOULD DECIDE WHETHER TO

CONTINUE ON THIS SUBJECT AT THE NEXT SESSION OR NOT. HE WOULD SUGGEST THAT THE PRESENT SESSION BE CONCLUDED AND THAT PARTICIPANTS SHOULD CONTINUE WITH THE SAME SUBJECT IN THE NEXT SESSION A WEEK HENCE. KHLESTOV SUGGESTED THAT PARTICIPANTS HAVE AN EXTRA MEETING ON THIS TOPIC BEFORE THEN SINCE THERE WOULD BE ONLY TWO MORE SCHEDULED INFORMAL SESSIONS IN THIS ROUND. UK REP SUGGESTED THAT PARTICIPANTS CONTINUE ON THE PRESENT TOPIC IN THE 8 JULY SESSION AND THEN REVERT IN THE SESSION OF JULY 15 TO A GENERAL DISCUSSION AS WAS USUAL AT THE END OF A ROUND. KHLESTOV RENEWED HIS PROPOSAL FOR AN EXTRA SESSION. UK REP SAID PARTICIPANTS SHOULD DISCUSS THIS TOPIC FURTHER IN SESSION PLANNED FOR JULY 8 AND THEN SEE IF AN ADDITIONAL SESSION WERE DESIRABLE. KHLESTOV AGAIN SUGGESTED A FURTHER SESSION PRIOR TO JULY 8. UK REP SAID THIS WOULD CAUSE DIFFICULTIES IN THE TIME TABLE. PARTICIPANTS SHOULD WAIT UNTIL JULY 8 TO DECIDE WHETHER A FURTHER SESSION WAS NEEDED.

48. IT WAS AGREED TO FOLLOW THE UK REPS SUGGESTION. THE NEXT INFORMAL SESSION WILL TAKE PLACE ON JULY 8. THE EAST WILL BE HOST.RESOR

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: EAST WEST MEETINGS, MEETING DELEGATIONS, CONSULTANTS, MUTUAL FORCE REDUCTIONS, NEGOTIATIONS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 04 JUL 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: ElyME
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975MBFRV00332
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D750232-0842
From: MBFR VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750783/aaaacwhb.tel
Line Count: 1001
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION ACDA
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 19
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: 75 MBFR VIENNA 0325
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: ElyME
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 01 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <01 APR 2003 by Izenbel0>; APPROVED <17 OCT 2003 by ElyME>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: INFORMAL SISSION WITH EASTERN REPS OF JULY 1, 1975
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE DOD
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006